

THE CONSERVATIVE CONVENTION AND
THE FUTURE DESTINY OF CANADA.

A SERMON,

AND ANSWERS TO LETTERS,

DELIVERED BY THE

REV. JOSEPH WILD, D.D.,

On Sunday Evening, December 4th, 1881, in the Bond Street
Congregational Church, Toronto.

Doubtless the announcement that Doctor Wild would preach on a question in which is centred so much interest to every Canadian as "The Conservative Convention and the Future Destiny of Canada," attracted a great crowd to Bond Street Church on Sunday evening. Long before seven o'clock every available space in the church was occupied; and punctually the service was commenced.

The sentiment expressed by the Doctor of loyalty to Canada, and his appreciation of the part Canada has to perform in the evangelization of the world, is one which, if realized by young Canadians especially, will result in good.

ANSWERS TO LETTERS.

From "Scholar." With respect to the word "Czar": I am glad that now, after so many weeks of investigation, you give me credit for being right in my definition of the derivation of the word. You say you have written to a dozen papers that furnish answers to correspondents; among others, the *Christian Union*, formerly Henry Ward Beecher's paper, now conducted by Lyman Abbott, a good scholar. You will remember I said the word "Czar," applied to the Emperor of Russia, came from Nebuchadnezzar, and you thought I was foolish. I am not so foolish as many people think, and you will generally find me correct in my derivation of words. Now, this is the answer you have got: "The word "Czar" is not derived from the Latin *Cæsar*, as several learned men erroneously suppose. It is an ancient Oriental word, as may be seen in the Slavonic translation of the Bible, and it was first given by us to the Emperors of the East, and afterwards to the Tartar Khans. It signifies in Persic, *i.e.*, the Persian

tongue, 'the throne,' or 'the supreme authority,' and it is to be traced in the termination of the names of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings—as, Phaleazar, Nabonassar, Nebuchadnezzar, Belteshazzar, etc. In one translation *Kessar* is written for *Cæsar*. But *Czar*, or *Tsar*, is altogether a different word." Now, I am glad you have got the honesty to confess that though you thought I was foolish, on investigation you found I was right.

From "Listener." About the ocean being above the earth as well as on the earth, the firmament dividing the two. The Bible says so. When a plain statement is made in the Bible, it does not depend for its truth upon your ability or mine to understand how God could do these things. Suffice it to say that the Bible distinctly declares that there was an ocean above as well as an ocean below. You have a difficulty in understanding how God could have given men light in that case. Quite easily. How do the creatures four miles deep in the ocean have light? And yet twenty years ago people supposed that there was no animal or vegetable life below one hundred fathoms deep. Science knows but little about itself, and when it tries to teach the Word of God, it is generally at a loss. God would look after the light. With respect to the organs of those days, and this organ, I do not think that you are a good judge of an organ at all. I think you must be an organist, and you never heard one organist praise another in your life, any more than one preacher praises another, or one butcher or tailor will speak well of another butcher or tailor.

From "Veritas." With respect to the original language: You say that all writers on philology are against the statements I made. They are not, sir; you cannot give me one single author by name, except such as discard this Bible. You make this great mistake: you say that Adam had to learn his language, and therefore the imperfections of the languages. The imperfections of the languages that have been made by men are very evident; but that is no argument for or against the first language: that God gave Adam. Because men have different diseases—scrofula and sore eyes—and because there are deaf and dumb men, do you suppose that Adam was so; or is this a thing that has come in since? Do you suppose that because there are defective colloquials and languages, that therefore Adam's language was incomplete? My dear sir, you are not on the right track of reasoning at all. Another mistake you make; you speak about a *written language*, as if God gave Adam a written language. That is not the idea. I made this statement, that God made Adam competent to speak; and when the beasts were brought before him, he had the ability to name them, just as he makes the animal world competent to take care of itself. God can put time and intelligence into a tree, a flower, a shell-fish, into animals, and *more so into man*. I do not think you are a sound reasoner at all on that point, because you do not take notice of the sequence of things. Answer me, if I am wrong.

From "Remember." With regard to Sunday work—"Is it right to work on Sunday?" Abstractly, it is not; but then necessity comes in and overrules abstract ideas very frequently, and oftentimes a man is of necessity driven to do what of his own good judgment and free choice he

would not do, having a family, and being somewhat dependent. My advice in such a case would be for him to get at some work where he would not have to work on a Sabbath just as soon as he reasonably can. However, "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." I hope the time will come when the Sabbath will be very thoroughly kept in Canada.

And now, with respect to the ark. Your letter is a very good one; still, I do not think that you are right, by any means. You say, for instance, "You stated that Noah's Ark was about the same size as the *Great Eastern*." Well, so it was in carrying capacity, about the same size. Then you conclude that it would be foolish to believe that in that ark God could put two and two of every kind, from the smallest insect to the greatest animal, with provisions for forty days. Now, my dear sir, you are astray in assuming that *every* animal was required to go in. It was only necessary for those of a *domestic* kind to go in, as I have shown you before in a former sermon. You say, you think if the ark had grounded, there would have been some evidence of it. There has been some evidence of it; and if you travel in Afghanistan, you will find that the Afghanistan people say that they have it; and if you happen to go near the Mount of Jacob, they will show you what they say is a piece of it fast in the snow and ice. However, I do not vouch for its being a piece of the real ark; but no doubt the ark was in existence for a long time, and may be now, for anything that I know. There is no more improbability in that than that we find animals thousands of years of age frozen in the snow and ice, as in the case of the animal I called your attention to, now kept in Rochester. Taking the story of the ark to be true, you ask how could the salt water fish live in fresh water? I do not say that they did live. Supposing they were destroyed, I still have the same evidence, as I pointed out to you last Sunday night, to believe that God could re-create, as you, if you are at all a scientist, believe that after the great epochs in geology, when all trace of animal and vegetable life has been swept off the earth, God re-peopled it again.

The other letter with respect to the ark. You ask if the ark would not rot in one hundred and twenty years, if made of gopher wood. The ark was not 120 years old; it was the *warning* that was 120 years old. You make the same mistake there as a great many writers make about the spirit filling the upper room. It was the *sound* that filled the room, not the spirit or the wind. God sent his spirit with the *sound* as of a rushing mighty wind, and it was the sound that filled the room. And so in this case: it was the warning that was 120 years old, not the ark itself.

Several letters I will again answer by reading part of the 56th chapter of Isaiah. If you were to come regularly you would be posted, but when you come and then stop away, and then come again, you get out of the track, and then you hardly understand what we are talking about, though I suppose you think that a difficult thing to do at any time. The question is: "Is not the theory of the Saxon race being the ten lost tribes of Israel a selfish one?" I repeat that it is not; that it takes in every man of every

race, color, clime, on the same footing that it takes in the literal Israel. I will read ; "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment and do justice : for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man," &c. The Doctor read on to the latter part of the 6th verse : "Every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant." Do you hear that? no matter whether you be a Pole or a Russian, a German, Frenchman, Sandwich Islander or an Indian, if you serve God, please Him, and "Take hold of His covenant," what will He do for you? "Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer ; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar, for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for *all people*." I think you will see you can be of any nationality or country, but because you happen to be a Russian, you cannot come into this covenant unless you *take hold of it* ; you cannot have its advantages unless you are willing to obey God ; whatever country you belong to, you have to take hold of this covenant, and then you are all right.



SERMON.

TEXT: Micah iv. 8: "And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

The word we translate "*tower*" here, in Hebrew is "*eder*," and it means a power standing prominently out over a group of powers; so that I can, without any violation of the strict and literal meaning of the word, apply it unto the Dominion of Canada, because I believe that the Dominion is a power that stands out now distinctly so. And when we consider her future, and the work that is assigned her of a kind Providence, she stands out, first, in loyalty; second, in her prosperity; third, in the extent of her territory; fourth, in the statesmanship that is now being manifested; fifth, in her commerce; sixth, in her morality; seventh, in her intelligence; and eighth, in her religious liberty. The term "*daughter of Zion*," in the text, is used for Christianity. Christianity is represented under the figure of a daughter quite frequently in the Scriptures, and because the Temple was built on Zion, therefore Christianity is represented as coming from Zion. Thus it is called the *daughter of Zion*. "*Dominion*:" this word means authority, the province of a lord or the territory of a sovereign. Thus it does no violence, I think, to the literal meaning to apply the text to our own Dominion.

It is very easy for me to see the partial fulfilment of prophecy in the existence of the Dominion of Canada, believing as I do that the Saxons are the ten lost tribes of Israel. Britain being Israel, she is God's executive for the civilization and evangelization of the whole world. The Abrahamic seed of race and of faith, of prophecy and of Christianity, God only accepts. He does not accept the seed of Brahma, or of Mahomet; He does not accept the prophecies of the Koran, or Mahomedan Bible; He does not accept the Scriptures of mythology; He does not accept the services of idolatry and paganism; He does not accept China as his nation; He does not accept any other but the Lord Jesus Christ and the truth founded on His revelations, and all those are Abrahamic that He has been pleased to accept. The stranger and the eunuch, as we read in Isaiah lvi., are included within the pale of this great covenant, and have the same privileges. Of whatever nationality or color they may be, they have the same right, and they can become the children of Abraham by faith, if they will agree to accept the covenant, and serve the Lord; for God intends His house to be, as Isaiah states, "a house of prayer for all people." The birthright, or birth privileges, in ancient times, were naturally given to the eldest child; and following that idea, it would be very natural to infer that Reuben being the eldest of the twelve children, he would have and be the

heir to all the privileges of the birthright of the eldest son of Jacob ; but, strange to say, Reuben is rejected, and the birthright is divided up among several distinct parties. Now, if you want the passage, you will find it in 1st Chronicles v. 1 : " Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel: for he was the first-born ; but, forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph, *and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright.*" And yet you will do it when you go out of this place to-night ; and yet, from almost every pulpit in the land, they will do that—they will reckon the genealogy after the birthright. " For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler ; but the birthright was Joseph's." Who came of Judah ? The chief ruler ? Who is the chief ruler ? Christ. You may spit in the face of the Jew, but he has the pre-eminence in this, that of his literal flesh, of the tribe of Judah, came the Saviour of all men. Now, you cannot help it. You say, I would like to reckon after some other genealogy than that of the Jew. You cannot, sir ; you must not reckon after the genealogy of the birthright ; you must reckon after what is right. Do you believe that Christ came from Judah ? Do you believe that that part of the birthright was taken from Reuben ; do you believe that ? " It is evident," Paul says, " that our Lord sprang from Judah." Can I get your consent to that ? Oh yes, you say, we all believe that. Will you believe that the other half of the birthright—political power—was given to Joseph ? No. Why ? Oh, well, I only believe that part of Scripture that I please. Oh, indeed ! That is the way you go and read the Bible, eh ? Yes ; I don't want to take in anything that would not be reasonable—according to my ideas. You don't, eh ? Well, I like to take in the whole Bible ; and I believe that as the chief ruler was to come from Judah in the person of Christ spiritually, it is so with the antitype, namely, the temporal ruling power, so that the kings furnished to rule over Israel and Judah are always to be of the Judaic line. Queen Victoria is a foreigner to Israel. You all know that she is a foreigner ; and yet she is obliged to rule over you and I, for the chief ruler is given to Judah, and you can no more have an Israelitish Christ than you can have an Israelitish King or Queen. You are Britons, but you are ruled over by a foreigner ; and God appointed it ; and you can never have a king of your own ; you must always have one from the line and extract of Judah. You know that Queen Victoria comes from James. On her mother's side she is a Benjamite, and on her father's side she is a Jewess. James came from Bruce, and Bruce from Kenneth ; Kenneth from Fergus, and Fergus from Earca ; and he from Tea Tephi, the daughter of Zedekiah. Here-mon, King of Ulster, married Zedekiah's daughter ; and thus is the seed of David brought down, and you dare not deny it. King James said, when taking the throne of England, Scotland and Ireland : " It becomes me, in accepting this crown, to acknowledge the great privilege that I am called to embrace, for I am a lineal descendant of the ancient Irish kings of Tara." Now, if King James was a descendant of the ancient Irish Kings of Tara, Queen Victoria is also ; and unless you are all descended

from those ancient kings too, they are both foreigners to you in that sense. Now, you have either got to say that you are, or you have got to admit that the pre-eminence is given to Judah. Just as the pre-eminence in furnishing the chief ruler is given to Judah, so also is the political power divided. Though they were not to furnish the king, they were to have the government and the rule. Christ, Britain and the United States are the divisions. I have referred to Judah, in the sense that Christ and the chief ruler were to come from Judah: "and the birthright was given to the sons of Joseph," not *son of Joseph*. How many sons had Joseph? Two; Ephraim and Manasseh. Therefore, the political line is to be divided into two. Is it divided into two to-day? Britain and the United States. The United States is Manasseh embodied, and England is Ephraim embodied. They are the only two nations on earth who are established in that line of the Abrahamic seed, and who can, by their legislation and by their trust in Providence, take men in without passport, of every nation, of every kindred, and of every clime. Now, you cannot find all the rule in Britain, because it was divided into two—to the sons of Joseph. Hence the prophetic future of Canada is enfolded in Britain, and Britain in Israel, and Israel in Judah. And if we wish to know what is to be the future of the British Empire, let us study the prophecies concerning Israel and its future; for if Britain be Israel, then what is said of Israel is said of Britain; and if Britain be not Israel, then Israel is somewhere else, and is destined to prevail and hold universal sway over all the world. These are conclusions, I think, that no one of you before me can well evade.

Let us consider our own country as being part of the large and prophetic empire. The part must partake of the whole; and what is really prophesied concerning Britain as Israel, must in a measure fall to the lot of the Dominion of Canada. Some, of course, will say that I have no right to reduce prophecy, or the line of Scripture interpretation, to the mean level of political economy. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*: "Let not the shoemaker go beyond his last." The politician will say, "Let not the minister go beyond his pulpit." But where does my pulpit go, is the first point to settle. Wherever I am interested as a Christian and a citizen. Where are the bounds laid down for me? Have you, has any one in the realm, rights as a political citizen that I have not? No, sir; no one in the whole Dominion. The Christian student, more than the mere politician, is interested in his country's destiny. He, of all men, cannot be incurious as to the future of his native or adopted land. He is not a partisan, but mostly cosmopolitan. He cannot look with indifference upon the legislation, he cannot look with indifference upon the future of his country; but at the same time, he will not be swayed by any partisan spirit. A higher law, the law of inspiration, will move him in all circumstances to exercise the freedom and privileges embodied in him.

As a citizen, I am interested in politics as well as any other man, though I am not to be taken as a partisan. I visited the late Convention to observe and take notes, to look upon its composition, that I might make or infer some judgment as to the future course of this, one of the great

ruling parties of our Dominion. I am free to say that I was pleased with the appearance of the men, and, as I said to the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, "There is a great change come over these conventions, in the appearance of the persons who are now sent to represent the interests of the people." Twenty-five years ago, when I attended something like this convention, the men were bloodshot in their eyes, they had bulbing noses and red faces; and when they got up they said: "Mishr Chair—(hic)—shairmansh, Mishr Shar-ar-man," showing us that they were men who loved the cup to excess, drinking deeply. I was glad to see clear countenances, steady eyes, and an intelligent expression among the audience. I was glad to see that they had the interest of the country at heart, and spoke from that standpoint. Such is the great change that has been wrought in Canada even in my day. And I am glad that this moral element is entering into our politics; I am glad that when a man wants to ask the suffrages and confidence of the people, he is now asked to be a *good* man, and a true man, and an intelligent man. May the moral element enter more and more into every choice that is made by either party in Canada.

If you look at the order of national growth, you will find that expediency must largely govern us; hence, looking out from the present standpoint alone, many things may seem to be unjustifiable, but expediency comes in with such helps as will forward us to the end. Let men, then, when they speak of the changes that have taken place in our country, in the confederation of the several Provinces, look at it as a matter of expediency; it has had its ratification and interpretation in that, and it is one of those progressive evidences that providence forces upon the country, preparatory to the universal rule, and the universal confederation of the Empire of Britain, and consequently, through her, of the whole world. I know, through the partisan strife that was so keen at that time, I know that there was a premature birth, and we came into existence, perhaps, a little too early; but individuals even, as well as nationalities, communities, states and nations, have their heroic period, which, when passed, must be supplemented with firmer and more compact forms of organization; and so, having passed the heroic period, we are now to settle down to grapple with greater questions and legislate on a wider area, a wider territory. A short time ago our legislatures could only legislate for a few thousand square miles of territory; now they can legislate for four million square miles of territory. We see in this Dominion, as it stretches from sea to sea, resources provided by Providence that are marvellous: coal and iron, and fertile fields and prairies, and wooded lands for the coming multiplying millions of the earth. And with the future increase that must come by emigration, combined with the natural multiplication of population, we want to legislate for the future; we want to be staid and careful in passing our laws and making our changes, for we are too large to make them suddenly.

What is the order of national growth? Population is first the basis of it, and in that particular I have no hesitation in saying that the Saxon

race is superior to all the other races on the face of the earth. The Saxon race, taking the British Empire at large, including the colonies, is doubling every 53 years, while, taking all the others, they are only doubling in every 95 years; so that in 100 years this Saxon element will tower up as the *eder* (tower), and will stand out prominently on the face of the earth; so that, upon her very prestige of population, Britain will hold the sceptre of supreme rule.

Then another factor in national growth is territory. Those that have territory can naturally invite and retain within their bounds the surplus of the multiplying millions of earth. We have 1,400,000,000 now, and these are going to double upon our hands in another 125 years, for that is the time we take to double as a whole. Now, where are you going to put the extra 1,400,000,000 of population? Do you not see how territory rises in magnitude and importance? Those that have the spare lands of the earth are the nations that will increase in power. Russia understands this, for she is getting all the land she can. England also understands it, for she too is getting all the land she can; so that national pre-eminence is contained in the vastness of the British Empire, which is already one-fourth of the whole world.

Another factor is language, and of course language is a power and this question has been settled on this continent finally. French, beautiful and fluent, is perishing; and one hates to see it die, yet this is not the soil for it to live on. It cannot prevail in the future legislation of any part of this country. It was the purpose of the early settlers of Manitoba to introduce French into the Legislature, and to introduce a certain kind of religion; but that could not be in the British Empire, and we will have to speak its language, whether we like it or not, and it is the language I am speaking now. And in this very language there is power; for a nation that is divided up in language cannot be as strong as a nation that has its unity cemented in one common tongue.

Commercially, we have another factor of national importance. A grand basis we have indeed for our commerce in this vast Dominion. Is there anything like it on the face of the earth? Take the territory bounded 1,200 miles by 700 miles; you cannot find an equal amount of territory so fertile in the whole earth as you find in the North-West country. And bear in mind that agricultural resources are the basis of commerce; and if you get a good broad platform for agricultural pursuits, you can start your commerce also on a broad basis. What nation has a broader basis than we? So that commercially we have a grand opportunity.

But this is the sore point; this is the weak point; this is the point that will puzzle the politicians and change votes, because England is yet a little adrift as to her next great mart. She wants to employ her millions and find remuneration for their labor; and she can do it. Where is her mart? Her next mart is Africa. That is the country that will employ all her spindles and all her gins, all the engines and all the wheels and factories that she can build for fifty years to come; that is the land where the people are half-naked; that is the land where the people live in bushes,

and holes and caves; that is the land to civilize. Ethiopia already stretches out her hands. England partly knows that this is her next mart, and is guarding carefully the interests of that continent. France knows it is a great mart, for she is making one bold stroke to open up outlets for the commerce of her own country; but it will be given unto England, after the great war. Now, that is the sore point between Canada and England. That is where we shall be troubled to adjust ourselves and keep easy; but by and by God will open up Africa, and then Canada will be free to supply herself, and even to help England at many points, especially in those things that are consumable, of grains, and meats and farm produce.

Another factor of national greatness is religion. I do not mean a State religion, but I mean a religion that speaks freedom and safety to every man; I mean a religion that is of the same spirit of truth, and though diverse in administration and operation, yet gives the right hand of fellowship to every true man, who shall worship God according to his own conscience; and there is no other nation on earth has that same element in its religion. Now, the very religion we have adopted argues that we have agreed to make all men free and equal before the law, and that is a world-wide provision; you see, we can go in anywhere with a religion like that. Russia cannot go in, because she wants to take the Greek Church religion with her; China cannot go in, because she wants to take her religion with her. We have a religion that is transplantable, and which can be taken by us to all nations and races of men.

Another factor is that of race. Mixtures, of course, will bring a sort of cosmopolitan character on to the stage, and the future Canadian will be somewhat different to what he is now. He will be different physiologically and in his ideas, and in many of his modes and methods of subsistence, and so forth. These mixtures will come in, and will test the Legislature for the next fifty years how these demands may be met. But the very strain will produce men great in legislation, and they will be equal to their task; physically, intellectually and morally, they will be superior. This poem is true of us in Canada:—

"Ye humble born and lowly, who crowd life's opening vale,
Think not that ye need wholly in life's great battle fail;
But scale the topmost story, the loftiest heights of fame,
And boldly strive for glory, to leave a noble name.
What if our birth be lowly, we've heart, we've courage still;
We can succeed, if slowly, we can, we may, if we will.
Rouse ye from thoughtless slumber, let hope's fair smile prevail,
And kindly hearts in number our onward course will hail.
Not birth, nor even station, in this fair land can mar
The lowest elevation, or humblest genius bar.
Here mind is the brightest treasure, the gem of costliest mould,
The true imperial measure of life's unsullied gold."

And so, dear friends, the end is inviting. We conclude the destiny of Canada to be, not independence, not annexation, but universal confederation with the British Empire, and, through the British Empire and the United States, universal confederation of the whole world finally. Some may object to this, as they objected to the confederation of the Provinces.

There were half of the people who prophesied that it would not work. There will be more than half of the people who will prophesy against this. No matter about politicians, what their ideas are; God wished us to federate, and He forced us into it; and when He wants the next federation brought about in connection with the British Empire, He will force us into that. We have the language, we have equality, we have destroyed the colored lines, we are free as a people can be; and with the freewill that governs us as individuals as well as a nation, we are ready to take in all the world. Our symbolisms are significant. The grand old lion of the forest is the mightiest of the beasts, and he must conquer in all the wild land. The oak, in its sturdiness and strength, was well chosen for this great empire, that must stand the storms of ages, and live when other trees have fallen; and the rose, which is universal in its nature, and can grow in any clime, is a fit symbol of the grander growth of this empire; and the cross—all hallowed be its memory—that speaks goodwill to men on earth, and wishes them to be in harmony with Heaven, is another.

Canada has a fair field, a grand future. Let us work in harmony with Providence, and we shall be successful if we do. I know of no country that can excel the real Canadians to-day—I speak without any reflection on any other nationality—I would not reflect upon my native born land; still, I love my adopted home, and I think that Canadians are the best physical specimens, intellectual specimens, moral specimens, and the best religious people, taken as a whole, on the face of the earth, and they have the best opportunities of any people that I know of; and if I were a young man in search of a country and home, I would choose this country in preference to any other.

Young men, first be true and loyal to Christ, and then true and loyal to your country. True love to Him will give permanence and prosperity to the land. As Lowell says in his beautiful poem:

“For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet humanity's vast frame.
Through its ocean-sundered fibres feels the gush of joy or pain.
In the gain or loss of one race, all have equal loss or gain.”

Let it be ours to be true to the instincts of nature, and let us be free to allow to all others the unalienable right of judgment and a free conscience. God bless every one.